operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1 2 Application of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors to retain and employ Leonard, Street and Deinard Professional 3 4 Association as counsel, nunc pro tunc to November 14, 2012 5 Application establishing the deadline for filing proofs of 6 7 claim and approving the form and manner of notice thereof 8 9 Motion by Debtors authorizing rejection of certain employment 10 agreements. 11 12 Sale Hearing Re: Motion by Debtors authorizing the debtors' 13 entry into the stalking horse purchase agreement, authorizing and approving the bidding procedures and break-up fee. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Transcribed by: Penina Wolicki 21 eScribers, LLC 22 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 23 New York, NY 10040 24 (973)406-2250 25 operations@escribers.net

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    APPEARANCES:
 3
    PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
 4
          Attorneys for Debtors
 5
          70 West Madison
          Suite 3800
 6
          Chicago, IL 60602
 7
 8
 9
    BY: MARK K. THOMAS, ESQ.
10
          PETER J. YOUNG, ESQ.
11
12
13
    PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
14
          Attorneys for Debtors
15
          Eleven Times Square
16
          New York, NY 10036
17
18
    BY: JARED ZAJAC, ESQ.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    DLA PIPER LLP (US)
 3
          Attorneys for Authentic Brands Group
 4
          203 North LaSalle Street
 5
          Suite 1900
 6
          Chicago, IL 60601
 7
 8
    BY:
          RICHARD A. CHESLEY, ESQ.
 9
          CHUN I. JANG, ESQ.
10
11
    SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL, LLP
12
          Attorneys for Amalgamated Health Fund
13
          919 Third Avenue
14
          New York, NY 10022
15
16
    BY: LAWRENCE V. GELBER, ESQ.
17
18
19
    GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.
20
          Attorneys for Salus Capital Partners
21
          200 Park Avenue
22
          New York, NY 10166
23
24
    BY: JEFFREY M. ROSENTHAL, ESQ.
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    GREENBERG TRAURIG, P.A.
 3
          Attorneys for Salus Capital Partners
 4
          333 Avenue of the Americas
 5
          Miami, FL 33131
 6
 7
    BY: PAUL J. KEENAN, JR., ESQ.
 8
 9
10
    KENNEDY, JENNIK & MURRAY, P.C.
11
          Attorneys for Workers United
12
          113 University Place
13
          New York, NY 10003
14
15
          THOMAS M. KENNEDY, ESQ.
    BY:
16
17
18
    KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP
19
          Attorneys for Midland Loan Services
20
          1100 Peachtree Street NE
21
          Suite 2800
22
          Atlanta, GA 30309
23
24
    BY: MATTHEW W. LEVIN, ESQ.
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    PRYOR CASHMAN LLP
 3
          Attorneys for Argyle Culture LLC
 4
          7 Times Square
 5
          New York, NY 10036
 6
 7
    BY: SETH H. LIEBERMAN, ESQ.
 8
 9
10
    BLANK ROME LLP
11
          Attorneys for Infor Global Solutions
12
          1201 Market Street
13
          Suite 800
14
          Wilmington, DE 19801
15
16
    BY: VICTORIA A. GUILFOYLE, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)
17
18
19
    MENTER, RUDIN & TRIVELPIECE, P.C.
20
          Attorneys for Destiny USA Holdings
21
          308 Maltbie Street
          Suite 200
22
23
          Syracuse , NY 13204
24
25
    BY:
          KEVIN M. NEWMAN, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)
                     eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250
```

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    HALPERIN BATTAGLIA RAICHT, LLP
 3
          Attorneys for Douglas Williams
 4
          555 Madison Avenue
 5
          9th Floor
 6
          New York, NY 10022
 7
 8
    BY: ALAN D. HALPERIN, ESQ.
 9
          DONNA H. LIEBERMAN, ESQ.
10
11
12
    ALSTON & BIRD LLP
13
          Attorneys for Jonesheirs.
14
          90 Park Avenue
15
          New York, NY 10016
16
17
    BY: JOHN W. SPEARS, ESQ.
18
19
    ALSO PRESENT: (TELEPHONICALLY)
20
          ALEX DAMBACH, City of Des Plaines Illinois
21
22
23
24
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: Can I have appearances, please?
3	MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mark Thomas
4	of Proskauer, with my colleagues Peter Young and Jared Zajac,
5	on behalf of HMX Acquisition Corp. and it's affiliated debtors
6	and debtors-in-possession.
7	MR. ROSENTHAL: Good afternoon Your Honor. Jeffrey M.
8	Rosenthal from Greenberg Traurig, with my colleague Paul
9	Keenan my partner, Paul Keenan, representing Salus Capital.
10	MR. KUGLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Kugler
11	from Leonard Street and Deinard on behalf of the official
12	committee of unsecured creditors.
13	MR. HALPERIN: Good morning afternoon, Your Honor.
14	Alan Halperin, Halperin Battaglia Raicht, here with my
15	colleague, Donna Lieberman, on behalf of Douglas Williams and W
16	Diamond.
17	MR. CHESLEY: Your Honor, Richard Chesley, DLA Piper,
18	with Chun Jang here on behalf of the stalking horse, ABG.
19	MR. KHODOROVSKY: Nazar Khodorovsky for the U.S.
20	Trustee, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Anyone else wish to note an appearance?
22	Anyone on
23	MR. NEWMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Kevin Newman, Menter,
24	Rudin & Trivelpiece, P.C., for Destiny USA Holdings, LLC.
25	THE COURT: For whom?

1	MR. NEWMAN: Destiny USA Holdings, LLC.
2	THE COURT: And what is your interest in the matter?
3	MR. NEWMAN: Landlord.
4	THE COURT: All right. Anyone else wish to note an
5	appearance.
6	MS. GUILFOYLE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Tori
7	Guilfoyle of Blank Rome, LLP, on behalf of Infor Global
8	Solutions Michigan, Inc.
9	THE COURT: And your interest in the matter?
10	MS. GUILFOYLE: We are a software licensor to the
11	debtor.
12	THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?
13	MR. DAMBACH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is
14	Alex Dambach with the City of Des Plaines.
15	THE COURT: Anyone else? All right, counsel, please
16	proceed.
17	MR. KUGLER: Your Honor, I believe the first matter on
18	the agenda is the application to employ Leonard Street and
19	Deinard filed by the unsecured creditors' committee at docket
20	number 205. This application was submitted to the U.S.
21	Trustee. Comments were received from the U.S. Trustee. We
22	made the changes in accordance with the U.S. Trustee's request.
23	We received no objection or other comments to the employment
24	application. And if it's acceptable to Your Honor, we'd ask
25	that it be approved.

1	THE COURT: Does anyone wish to be heard?
2	MR. KHODOROVSKY: Your Honor, Nazar Khodorovsky for
3	the U.S. Trustee. In light of the revisions made, the U.S.
4	Trustee has no objection. Thank you, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Very well. Do you have a revised order?
6	MR. KUGLER: We can submit one, Your Honor. I don't
7	have one.
8	THE COURT: Well, please do so as soon as possible.
9	All right. Anything else till we get to the sale?
10	All right, please go ahead.
11	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor. Mark Thomas on
12	behalf of the debtors. Your Honor, we are pleased and relieved
13	to report that we have a fully consensual sale order that would
14	approve the debtors' motions for orders authorizing the sale of
15	substantially all of our assets to our stalking-horse
16	purchaser. The motion was docket number 21.
17	We have worked with the objectors, principally the
18	union, which filed two objections, and the unsecured creditors'
19	committee. We've resolved those objections.
20	THE COURT: Is the union here?
21	MR. KENNEDY: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Well, come forward and give your
23	appearance.
24	MR. KENNEDY: Excuse me, Your Honor. Tom Kennedy;
25	Kennedy Jennick & Murray for Workers United.

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

THE COURT: Please have a seat. You bought a seat at the table.

All right. Please go ahead, Mr. Thomas.

MR. THOMAS: And, Your Honor, we've also resolved the objections filed by the committee. The union and the committee filed the real substantive objections, although we do have a host of objections with respect to adequate assurance of future performance, cure costs. And my colleague, Mr. Young will walk through the Court through those. We believe we've resolved virtually all of those, but we'll pick that up a little bit later.

Your Honor, I would say that I think it's important in support of the relief requested, that Your Honor take judicial notice of certain declarations of people that are here in court and are willing and able to testify if necessary with respect to the facts set forth in their declarations. And the record should reflect that in support of the order, we would submit the declaration of Geoffrey A. Richards. He's with William Blair. He's been leading the engagement on behalf of the debtor's investment banker, William Blair. And his declaration was filed at docket number 257. It is an extensive declaration that lists the many pre-petition and post-petition marketing efforts that were run by the investment banker on behalf of this debtor, commencing in August, two months before the petition date, and then picking up again in November -- early

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

November -- November 5th, after a no-shop clause expired upon the entry of your bidding procedures orders.

Your Honor, there's also a declaration of Michael O'Hara. Michael O'Hara is also in court. He is the independent director of the debtors. His declaration is docket number 256. Mr. O'Hara was appointed as independent director by the debtors' boards of directors in August 2002 (sic), prior to the commencement of these bankruptcy cases, and was granted the sole and exclusive power and authority over the entire sale process and the bankruptcy process. And Mr. O'Hara's declaration principally deals with his role as an independent director, his activity in connection with the sale process, and the fact that all decisions regarding the sale process, regarding the choice of the stalking-horse bidder, and regarding how to proceed with the sale process, were subject to his direction and control as independent director.

Your Honor, we would also submit the declaration of Mr. Michael Healy. Mr. Healy is a managing director of CDG Co. and CDG Co. has been employed as financial advisor to the debtors. His declaration is docket number 258. Mr. Healy's declaration principally deals with the facts that the liquidity crisis that these debtors have faced since spring of 2012 commencing (sic) in July 2012 when we defaulted on our payment obligations under our original 2009 credit agreement, and continue on through this case, are so acute that extending the

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

sale process or otherwise continuing the sale process could possibly result in irreparable harm to the estate, and that the costs would require a substantial new debtor-in-possession financing facility.

Your Honor, Douglas Williams, the CEO of the debtors, has submitted two declarations. The first was docket number 3, which was submitted in connection with our first-day pleadings. And the second recent declaration was submitted by Mr. Williams, by his counsel, Mr. Halperin -- he has separate counsel. It's docket number 247. And it was submitted in response to the objections filed by the committee to the sale.

Your Honor, the ultimate outcome of the situation is that there were no qualified bids that were received by the debtors in accordance with the bidding procedures that were approved. And three different bidding procedures orders were entered. Rather unusual, Your Honor, but we had an unusual and rocky start to the case, given the hurricane, which delayed the appointment of a creditors' committee, which resulted in some interim bid procedures orders, two of them being entered before the committee really had time to get up to speed. And those bid procedures orders were docket number 104, docket number 169 and docket number 185.

We were pleased to file, Your Honor, a letter, docket number 220, which reflected the fact that on or about December 11th, the stalking-horse asset purchase agreement that had been

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

submitted in October had become a firm commitment for a going-concern sale. And as we've discussed in prior court hearings, when we filed this case in October, we had a stalking-horse bid. And the bid could either be a going-concern bid or a liquidation bid.

The only firm nonconditional aspect of the stalkinghorse agreement was the liquidation aspect. The going-concern
aspect was subject to two conditions. And we had no idea
whether those conditions would ever be met or fulfilled. But
we wanted to have the opportunity and the time to have those
conditions fulfilled so a going-concern sale could occur.

The conditions were that number one, the stalking-horse buyer, Authentic Brands, enter into a license agreement with a company that Mr. Douglas Williams would form. The second condition was that the newly formed license company, formed by Mr. Williams, would have financing acceptable to the stalking-horse bidder in the stalking-horse bidder's sole discretion.

THE COURT: Who is providing the financing to Mr. Williams, or his company?

MR. THOMAS: The financing -- Your Honor, the financing with Mr. Williams will be provided by Salus Capital. Salus Capital is the debtors' DIP lender. Salus Capital is the debtors' pre-petition lender. And, Your Honor, Salus Capital came on the scene -- and these are in the declarations -- on or

1	about August 14th of 2012. In July of 2012, a refinancing
2	effort failed. The debtors had arranged financing with Salus
3	Capital, and Salus was ready, willing, and able to close in
4	July. However the debtors' principal owners, a publicly traded
5	company, SKNL, had committed to infuse twenty-five million
6	dollars into the debtors as part of that refinancing. And that
7	twenty-five million dollars would have been critical new
8	liquidity for the debtors' operations.
9	On the eve of the July 16th closing of the
10	refinancing, the debtors were informed that their owners were
11	not able to make the required equity infusion, and therefore
12	the refinancing did not
13	THE COURT: We're let's leave history the
14	history had been presented to me in every hearing. I think I
15	recall enough of it.
16	MR. THOMAS: Okay.
17	THE COURT: So what we're doing, in essence, is to
18	separate out the ownership of the brands and the ownership of
19	the business the operating business, which is called the
20	license agreement. Is that what we're doing?

MR. THOMAS: That is absolutely correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And Salus is financing both sides of this, or just the licensee side?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. THOMAS: To my knowledge, Salus is only financing the licensee side, in other words, the operating company.

1	THE COURT: The operating company is taking over the
2	entirety of the business of the debtor, more or less? Is
3	that
4	MR. THOMAS: Yes, the operating company is assuming
5	the collective bargaining agreement with the union workers, has
6	the ability to offer employment to non-union workers, and is
7	taking over the real estate, machinery and equipment, and the
8	working capital assets, receivables and inventory, and then
9	will have a license to manufacture the branded goods that will
10	now be owned by the licensor, Authentic Brands.
11	THE COURT: Which is ABG?
12	MR. THOMAS: ABG.
13	THE COURT: ABG being an independent company with its
14	own resources?
15	MR. THOMAS: Its own resources. A well-known
16	THE COURT: Whatever they are.
17	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
18	THE COURT: All right. Now, I understand that there
19	was another potential purchaser that made a bid, but that
20	and got an extension of time, and withdrew the bid.
21	MR. THOMAS: Correct, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Do you know why the bid was withdrawn?
23	MR. THOMAS: I the purchaser had appeared in court
24	before.
25	THE COURT: They appeared

1	MR. THOMAS: Their counsel
2	THE COURT: they appeared by counsel several times.
3	MR. THOMAS: Right. Their counsel is not in court
4	today. I spoke to counsel on Monday Monday, December 17th,
5	at 7:30 a.m., and was told that the potential bidder could not
6	get comfortable with the risks posed by operating the US
7	manufacturing facilities and the union work force. In essence,
8	they couldn't get comfortable with the operational risks of
9	taking stepping into the IPCo/OpCo structure.
10	The potential bidder had been involved in the process
11	since September, pre-petition, had reengaged, did request
12	extensions, did provide a bid by Friday, December 14th, and we
13	worked over the weekend to try to make that bid a qualified
14	bid, and ultimately they determined to withdraw the bid. So
15	there was not an auction in accordance with the bid procedures
16	rules.
17	THE COURT: All right.
18	MR. THOMAS: In lieu of an auction, we spent the day
19	trying to craft a compromise between the committee, the union,
20	the debtors, Authentic Brands, and the licensing company, and
21	we were successful in achieving that.
22	THE COURT: Well, I see that. That is Exhibit D to
23	the sale order.
24	MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. And that

THE COURT: This is new to me, which is fine. I'm not

25

complaining. But how is this going to be effectuated?

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, it would -- parts of it are effectuated under the sale order. Others will have to be effectuated in corporate governance documents of the licensee entity. And other parts will have to be effectuated through a plan that the debtors and the committee hope to confirm.

There are releases that will really be effectuated through a plan. There are corporate governance provisions whereby the committee will have the ability to designate a board member of the license company. There are equity participation or profit participation rights, whereby the licensing company will make profit participations available to all employees of the company, including the rank and file union workers. There's a bucket for the employees. There's a bucket of profit participation for the unsecured creditor body, which we anticipate will be a trust created upon confirmation of a plan.

There's a bucket of equity for executive management, other than Mr. Williams. And there's a slice of equity available, because this license company will have to have an independent director that was part of the negotiations. And there's a possibility that an independent director would like some equity upside and that that is made available as well.

THE COURT: And if there's no plan?

MR. THOMAS: If there's no plan, I think we would

probably -- and we've discussed this but it's not in here --1 we've discussed this with the committee. We think that --2 THE COURT: I'm not assuming there will be no plan. 3 I'm just trying to look forward. This company will have 4 5 virtually no assets left --6 MR. THOMAS: Yes. 7 THE COURT: -- other than a lot of lawyers. I guess the committee still has its investigation period. And 8 somebody's going to have to draft a plan. But it won't have 9 10 any business operations. 11 MR. THOMAS: No business operations, Your Honor. 12 There will cash payments to the estate at closing. So there --13 THE COURT: We'll get to that. That's new to me too. 14 So we'll get to that -- we'll get to where the cash goes. 15 Let's stick with the sale. But explain -- yes, how is Exhibit 16 D going to be effectuated? 17 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, it's --18 THE COURT: Through a plan --19 MR. THOMAS: A plan. 20 THE COURT: I suppose it could be effectuated otherwise if it had to be? 21 22 MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. We think there's 23 basically -- this debtor-in-possession has three options. Ιt 24 will -- there will either be a plan or there will be a 25 conversion and a trustee will take control.

1	THE COURT: No, there won't be a conversion
2	MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: because there won't be a sale.
4	MR. THOMAS: Thank you. We don't think there
5	THE COURT: There won't be a sale today unless you can
6	give me and Mr. O'Hara is going to take the stand and assure
7	me that this debtor can pay its administrative and priority
8	claims. That's been I think I've been pretty clear that
9	we're not going to have a sale in this case and have an
10	administratively insolvent estate.
11	MR. THOMAS: You have been. And we have been
12	preparing and negotiating to accomplish that goal. And we have
13	accomplished that goal.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. THOMAS: I was just speaking hypothetically.
16	There's only three ways for a debtor to get out of
17	THE COURT: Well, that's true.
18	MR. THOMAS: bankruptcy.
19	THE COURT: Hypothetically.
20	MR. THOMAS: So, and we don't want that either.
21	THE COURT: And it can happen. One never knows.
22	MR. THOMAS: And the other way, Your Honor,
23	hypothetically, would be a structured dismissal. And what I
24	would say is if there in any of those circumstances, the
25	consideration that the committee bargained for would transfer

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

to some kind of trust created for the benefit of the holders of allowed unsecured claims. The governance will -- the governance of the licensee will take care of the board seats and the governance.

THE COURT: Yes, that's -- that is certainly something that can be effectuated outside of a plan. All right.

You wanted me to take notice -- to accept as a proffer, the three declarations that you referred to that were submitted in connection with your motion for the sale. Is there any objection to my taking those declarations as a proffer?

MR. KUGLER: No objection from the committee, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. No other objections? Does anyone wish to cross-examine?

All right. I'd like to ask Mr. O'Hara or -- invite you to ask him a few questions, with regard to his governance of the debtor, his independence, and that we have, on the numbers that you are proposing to include in the sale order -- and we'll get to that -- we have an administratively solvent estate. We know we can pay the administrative claims and the priority claims.

Obviously, it would nice if we had an unsecured creditors' recovery, but I don't think Congress gave me the power or the right to set a minimum recovery for unsecured

- creditors, as much as unsecured creditors would like me to do that sometimes.
- 3 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, I would call Mr. Michael O'Hara.
- 5 THE COURT: Please state your name for the record.
- THE WITNESS: Michael O'Hara.
- 7 (Witness sworn)
- 8 THE COURT: Please be seated.
- 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 10 BY MR. THOMAS:
- 11 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. O'Hara.
- 12 A. Good afternoon.
- 13 Q. Did you submit a declaration on or about December 17th, in
- 14 connection with the debtors' response to the committee's
- 15 objection to the sale motion?
- 16 A. I did.
- 17 Q. Did you review that declaration?
- 18 A. I did.
- 19 Q. Did you comment on the declaration?
- 20 A. I did.
- 21 Q. And is that declaration true and correct?
- 22 A. It is.
- 23 Q. When did you first become engaged by these debtors?
- A. I became appointed as the lead independent director on or
- 25 around August 15th, shortly after Salus Capital became the

1 debtor's senior secured lender.

- Q. And upon your appointment in August of 2012, do you recall what the situation was with the debtor?
- A. Yes. The -- we had a week or two in which the debtor's primary equity investor could make an additional equity investment. And if they did that, the company had great plans to progress towards its growth. In the absence of that investment, the debtors had agreed with their secured lender to run an orderly sale process. They had agreed with a lender to

Because there was a possibility that the company's equity investor may make an equity investment or may otherwise have an impact on the sale process they -- the lender and the equity investor agreed to separate out the sale monitoring corporate governance component to an independent director. And so that's why they asked me to come in at that time.

appoint an investment banker -- in this case, William Blair --

- Q. Have you served as a director before?
- 19 A. I have, indeed, yes.

to lead a process.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. And have you ever been engaged in the marketing or sale of a company?
- 22 A. Yes. It's a regular part of my regular business.
- THE COURT: What is your regular business, Mr. O'Hara?
- THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I'm the founder and chief
- 25 executive officer of a boutique investment banking firm by the

1	name of Consensus. We work exclusively with retail and
2	consumer product companies. We work with companies, really, at
3	any stage of their life. We work with early stage growing
4	companies, where we raise capital for them. We work with
5	companies in the mid-market, that are looking to sell
6	themselves or to buy or acquire other entities. We do
7	financial advisory work where we will sometimes be investment
8	bankers to distressed companies. We'll act and serve as chief
9	restructuring officers. We do due diligence and valuation work
10	for investors and lenders. So we do all of those things. So
11	everything from early stage to death and dying within retail
12	and consumer.
13	THE COURT: Let me just point out, we don't usually
14	have death and dying in this courtroom. We speak of it as
15	restructuring and rehabilitation. But I suppose we were
16	talking about conversion a few moments ago. So it can happen.
17	How many employees does your company have?
18	THE WITNESS: Our firm has thirteen employees in the
19	United States and one in London, England.

20 THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. THOMAS:

21

22

23

24

- Q. And, Mr. O'Hara, when you began your engagement in August 2012, did you have an understanding about whether Blair had just been retained by the debtors?
- 25 A. No. I understood that Blair had been involved for nearly

- 1 the entire year, looking to raise capital for the company.
- 2 Q. The owners didn't put in the equity. The sale process
- 3 proceeded. Can you explain your role in the marketing and sale
- 4 process from the time of August when you were engaged up until
- 5 on or about October 18th, when these debtors filed their
- 6 Chapter 11 petitions?
- 7 A. Yes. And Your Honor, if you don't mind, I'll go back a 8 little bit into history. Our firm --
- 9 THE COURT: You can summarize.
- 10 THE WITNESS: I'll summarize as quickly as possible.
- THE COURT: You don't have to go over the entire
- 12 history, because first, I remember the affidavits, and
- 13 secondly, I'm most interested in getting to the question of
- 14 administrative solvency.
- MR. THOMAS: Well --
- 16 THE COURT: But go ahead.
- 17 THE WITNESS: I'll be very brief.
- 18 THE COURT: Give me a summary. I don't mean to
- 19 preclude Mr. Thomas from asking you any questions that he
- 20 thinks should be answered.
- 21 A. And the reason I mention this, it goes to -- it goes to
- 22 Mr. Thomas' question. Our firm conducted extensive due
- 23 diligence on behalf of Salus back when they thought they were
- 24 doing a loan to the company in June and July. And so when I
- 25 was engaged to be the board member in the middle of August, I

- hit the ground running, so to speak, and oversaw the process 1 2 from day one with a pretty good understanding of the company, so immediately helped oversee and comment on the confidential 3 4 information memorandum that the Blair team had put together and immediately helped providing names, and in some instances 5
- 7 Okay. And you know that the stalking-horse bid had what we call the IPCo/OpCo structure. And do you think that was 8 beneficial for these debtors, and why?

introductions to potentially interested parties.

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- We do. At the time the IPCo/OpCo structure was first Α. proposed, our only legitimate alternatives were liquidation of the company in a manner that would have left our employees out of work in their entirety. We put a lot of effort in -- myself and the William Blair team, as well as Doug Williams, looking for a going-concern buyer. At the time the IPCo/OpCo structure was worked through, and I was a part of pulling all of that together, it was the only option on the table to keep the business going forward and keep employees employed.
- Mr. O'Hara, in connection with the proposed sale to the stalking-horse purchaser, did you have occasion to attempt to determine whether or not the sale would produce sufficient receipts for the company to pay its accrued and projected goforward administrative expenses?
- I'm glad Your Honor raised it, because it's been a 24 25 focus of ours from the beginning. The initial purchase price

1	that was proposed to us under the IPCo/OpCo bid, was, indeed,
2	not sufficient to cover what we projected to be our
3	administrative needs. We negotiated for a price that would get
4	us over our projected needs. And that's why the price you saw
5	in our purchase agreement was effectively the level of the
6	Salus claim plus 5.1 million dollars. In addition to that, as
7	you know, Your Honor, from reading all the papers in this case,
8	the estate gained an additional three million dollars in what's
9	the so-called Salus discount. So we have about 8.1 million
10	dollars, plus we've got money funded into an escrow for
11	professional fees.
12	THE COURT: Is that on account of the carve-out to
13	date or otherwise?
14	MR. THOMAS: It has been funded, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: It has been funded by Salus, therefore
16	it's part of the Salus claim?
17	MR. THOMAS: Yes. Part of the DIP loan, pursuant to
18	the DIP budget. And it does satisfy the carve-out. Although
19	nothing because of the pace of the case, there have been no
20	interim payments. But the escrow's been established.
21	THE COURT: But there've been monthly do we have a
22	monthly fee
23	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we do have an interim
24	THE COURT: order?
25	MR. THOMAS: comp order. But because of the delay

1	in the hearings, it wasn't entered until, I think November
2	29th
3	THE COURT: So it hasn't had any effect.
4	MR. THOMAS: Correct.
5	THE COURT: But those fees are considered as in effect
6	earned or paid? They're part of the Salus claim? Is that how
7	it works or
8	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, how it works is that the DIP
9	loan provided for a budget which included projected
10	professional fees. Because we realized the case would move so
11	quickly, we had those fees sort of paid into an escrow, subject
12	to court allowance of professional fees. The idea being if
13	there was a sale and the DIP wasn't drawn, there would be
14	nothing to pay admin claims that had accrued to get to that
15	sale.
16	So it is part of the Salus claim, everything that has
17	been deposited into that professional fee escrow account.
18	THE COURT: And how much is in there right now?
19	MR. THOMAS: I think right now there's approximately
20	2,100,000 dollars.
21	THE COURT: And what is what are the other
22	administrative claims projected, to date? Do we have a
23	BY MR. THOMAS:
24	Q. Mr. O'Hara, in addition to professional
25	THE COURT: an approximate amount?

A. We do, Your Honor. If you don't mind, myself refreshing my recollection by looking --

THE COURT: No, please.

A. -- at the document.

THE COURT: If you have -- if you have something, that would be very helpful.

A. The great majority of the fees that will be owed by the estate do relate to professional fees. That's because in large part the negotiations with ABG and the licensee resulted in the licensee assuming a decent amount of what might have otherwise been 503(b)(9) claims. So we're fortunate that the 503(b)(9) claims that we think we're retaining are very modest. But those are part of the dollars that we've covered.

We do have some priority tax claims that we are -- that we are -- that we've projected to pay. We have put in place as well some dollars to provide for administrative services to the estate as it winds down. We are -- we have negotiated, we believe, with ABG and the licensee to be able to continue to use retained employees. But we also believe we'll need to hire back some employees who will provide certain functions such as reconciliation of invoices, as well as perhaps the preparation of tax returns and dealing with customs issues and things like that.

So we've put together a budget that covers all of that.

And with regard to professional fees, our expectation is that

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

we will work together between the debtors' professionals and the committee's professionals. And Mr. Kruger (sic) and I are talking about that tomorrow. But our expectation is that we have some money put aside for counsel for both entities. We have CDG continuing to run financial information to prepare MORs and things of that nature and help with the distribution. We have a claims agent. And so all of those things have been projected out through a plan of liquidation or a plan of distribution.

And we believe we've got sufficient funds for it. And, Your Honor, unless we run into another bump in the road -- and

And we believe we've got sufficient funds for it. And,

Your Honor, unless we run into another bump in the road -- and

as you know, we've run into every possible bump in the road so

far -- we believe that the money that we have retained from the

deal will provide us with something to distribute to unsecured

creditors in the form of cash.

And as Mr. Thomas previously pointed out, we also need to account for the distribution of profit interests in the new licensing entity. So we hope we will have cash and these equity-like instruments to distribute through a plan. And Poskauer and committee counsel have already put their heads together about how we'll effect that.

THE COURT: All right. What -- do we have a number for unsecured claims, an approximate amount? Just for curiosity?

MR. KUGLER: Your Honor, kind of at the outset, it is

- our understanding that unsecured claims are twenty-three, 1 2 twenty-four million. Eight million of those are going to be assumed, approximately, by the -- by the licensee. That leaves 3 about fifteen million. Now that excludes a claim by the prior 4 owner of the debtor, SKNL. They have, I believe, a nineteen-5 6 million-dollar claim that the committee's going to need to take 7 a hard look at in terms of where it should fall in the priority chain. But that's the best of our understanding at this point. 8 9
 - THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right.
- 10 MR. THOMAS: I have no fur --
- THE COURT: I have no questions -- no further 11 12 questions of Mr. O'Hara.
- 13 MR. KUGLER: I have no further questions.
- 14 MR. KHODOROVSKY: I have two brief questions of Mr.
- 15 O'Hara.
- 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 17 BY MR. KHODOROVSKY:
- Mr. O'Hara, after the sale -- if the sale is approved 18 0.
- today by His Honor and the sale closes, who will be in charge 19
- of running the companies' affairs from day to day; in other 20
- 21 words, signing corporate documents, complying with corporate
- 22 formalities?
- 23 Unless the parties that are involved in the process choose
- otherwise, I intend to remain in this position to do so. 24
- 25 Q. And Mr. O'Hara, will you be willing to sign the debtors'

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

operating reports and the plan and disclosure statements of the debtors, the proposed one? I will. Α. MR. KHODOROVSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. No further questions. THE COURT: Thank you. Anyone else? All right, thank you very much, Mr. O'Hara. THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Anything else, Mr. Thomas, or from any other party, with regard to approval of the sale? MS. GUILFOYLE: Your Honor, this is Tori Guilfoyle of Blank Rome. I believe the debtors have still yet to address the assumption and assignment issues. Is that correct? THE COURT: That is correct, yes.

MS. GUILFOYLE: Okay, thank you, Your Honor.

MR. KUGLER: Your Honor, Robert Kugler, again, on behalf of the committee. And I will keep it brief, unless Your Honor would like to hear from me on a more lengthy basis. We're prepared to present either an offer of proof of testimony, if the Court would like to get the sense of perspective from the committee.

But in the thirty-five days we've been involved in this case, we have worked as a committee, extraordinarily hard. I would imagine we've had at least twenty meetings between those thirty-five days. A fully engaged, active committee.

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

tried everything that we could think of to come up with additional bidders, or alternatively, to come up with financing to extend the auction period so that we would have time to come up with additional bidders. We turned over ever rock. We looked in every nook and cranny; and we thought we had one.

And we worked very, very hard with that particular bidder, who walked away twice, came back a third time.

At 2 a.m. on Monday morning, we had a deal. They were going to come in and we were going to have an auction the next morning. And by the time I got out of the shower the next morning, they had evaporated into the ether.

We didn't have a lot of great choices at that point in time. And we sat down with the debtor and with ABG and engaged in what I would characterize as vigorous but very good-faith negotiations. We negotiated throughout the better part of the day. The committee was locked up in a conference room and was informed and kept regularly apprised of the situation. And by that evening, we had reached an agreement.

The agreement isn't perfect. But as my mentor taught me, you can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And it is a good agreement. The estate -- the creditors are going to get cash in some amount. And that currently looks like it could be a seven-figure amount, possibly; knock on wood. They're going to get profit participation units in the new operating entity. And they're going to get to keep those

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

profit participation units until all unsecured claims are paid in full. That may never happen. But if the company does as well as ABG believes it will, there's an opportunity for some real upside.

We were able to have the new entity assume a third of the unsecured debt in the case. It's a significant factor and really is another form of recovery for the unsecured creditors here. The new --

THE COURT: Plus the union contracts.

MR. KUGLER: Plus the union contracts. Absolutely.

They're also assuming Mr. Williams' contracts, which are a

liability that will not be part of our estate as we go forward.

We're going to have a board seat on the operating company going forward. We're going to have participation at the management level, so we can see what's going on and hopefully help guide it to be a very successful entity. That board seat is going to be filled by the soon-to-be former chairman of the committee, Mr. Roup. ABG had a good conversation. They proposed that Mr. Roup fill that board seat. Mr. Roup was not part of the committee decision to allow that to happen. He recused himself from that. But he has a very deep and very broad understanding not only of this industry but of this particular debtor. He was a committee member on the prior Hart Marx bankruptcy case. He's the chairman of the committee in this case. He doesn't want to be

a committee member on a third Hart Marx bankruptcy case.

So he will be resigning, much to my chagrin, from the committee. And he will go forward on the board of the new OpCo. Like I said, we're going to have a voice in management, who's going to be managing the new entity. And we're going to get the opportunity to participate in the selection of an independent board member. So we're going to have kind of a different situation going forward. We're going to be a partner; maybe a junior partner, but we're going to be a partner in this operation going forward. And we are going to take that very seriously, because each ten percent of profit comes back to our folks.

And when I say the ten percent, that's to the creditors. The rank and file employees are getting ten percent as well. And so we're not going to lose sight of that.

Your Honor, it's been -- I think the last time I was in here I said I feel like I live between a rock and a hard spot in this case. And it has been difficult. There has been incredible effort on behalf of the committee. I've represented numerous committees, and I've not seen a committee try as hard as it has here to bring about a good result. Our number one goal was to have a viable entity going forward. We've got that.

And now we're talking about a return to the creditors that is significant. It's a good result, and we support it,

1 Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Anyone else?

Mr. Khodorovsky, why don't you wait for a moment.

MR. HALPERIN: Alan Halperin on behalf of Douglas
Williams and W Diamond. Your Honor, I've appeared before you
several times and I made certain statements. And I am pleased
to say that at the end of the day, while perhaps an auction
didn't occur, one of Mr. Williams' overarching goals did occur.
The company doesn't have to liquidate, and that 1,100 people's
jobs get saved.

I will tell you that he spent this morning up in Rochester at the plant. He planned to go to Chicago as well. He couldn't do it logistically, so he's going to be having a video conference with them tomorrow. Pleased to hear that basically, when he walked in the room to speak with people what happened was a standing ovation and a thank you for saving jobs.

This has been a very difficult, hard-fought process.

People can have differences of opinion. It's been very difficult on him, but ultimately the process worked. And we have a company that doesn't get liquidated, and we're all very pleased about that.

Just so we are a little bit clear, Mr. Kugler indicated that he had conversations with ABG, but the concessions were those of the OpCo, which ABG is not a part of.

ABG very graciously and I think wisely served as an intermediary, because tempers had gotten very hot. There were concerns and issues and perhaps even a little bit of acrimony back and forth in the heat of the moment, and ABG served as an intermediary and helped to broker a deal.

At the end of the day, it's everybody's goal that this company succeed. And once Mr. Williams knew that he was going to be the guy, at that point, as long as he had appropriate, intelligent, savvy businesspeople on a board, it was time to talk about making those kinds of concessions, and making them because it would work and it would help.

We're pleased with the outcome. We're pleased that the jobs are going to be saved. And we think ultimately this is the best result for the company.

THE COURT: Thank you. Anyone else?
Yes, sir.

MR. KENNEDY: Your Honor, Tom Kennedy on behalf of Workers United. I'm not going to belabor the point. We believe this is in arrangement that does maintain these jobs and provides the opportunity, equally importantly, for these facilities to grow. They have not been working forty hours at those facilities because of a lack of materials and a lack of capital. And we believe that we've become comfortable now with the leadership that ABG and Mr. Williams and the new board will be giving. And we're looking forward to working with this

company and negotiating a new collective bargaining agreement
and being able to grow this portion of the industry. So thank
you.

THE COURT: Thank you. It's all very hopeful for the future.

Mr. Khodorovsky?

MR. KHODOROVSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You can stay there.

MR. KHODOROVSKY: Oh, thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate that. Nazar Khodorovsky for the U.S. Trustee. Your Honor, I'll be extremely brief.

Your Honor, when the U.S. Trustee saw the revised sale order, the order and the Exhibit D were as new to the U.S. Trustee as they were to Your Honor. However, as a result of discussions, and I believe those discussions were productive, certain revisions were made to the order and to the Exhibit D, which I believe are consensual.

The revisions to Exhibit D ensure that any releases that Mr. Williams is to receive will be undertaken as part of a plan, with the consent of the creditors' committee. The U.S. Trustee's also gratified that Mr. Roup will be resigning from the committee, as I understand it, effective tomorrow.

The U.S. Trustee is also gratified that the proposed sale order was revised to ensure that William Blair, the investment banker, will comply with its retention order and

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

will	file	an	appı	ropriate	fee	apr	plication,	and	that	all	fees
will	be s	ubie	ect t	to Your	Honoı	r's	review.				

And finally, Your Honor, an earlier draft of Exhibit D indicated that Mr. Roup was to have a consulting arrangement with the licensee entity, Your Honor. And that has been removed from, I think, the revised Exhibit D. So in light of all of these revisions, Your Honor, the U.S. Trustee has no further objection. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, Exhibit D says that Mr. Roup will provide consulting services. It doesn't speak of any agreement. I gather that's being left for the future. There's no pre-existing deal, but there's no preclusion against any such deal. Is that right?

MR. KHODOROVSKY: There's no preclusion, Your Honor. But to the best of my understanding, the latest draft, as the parties have discussed, eliminates the language "current consulting position" for Mr. Roup. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Nothing current, in other words?

MR. CHESLEY: No, Your Honor. Richard Chesley, DLA Piper. I rise very, very briefly. As the stalking horse -- hopefully the successful --

THE COURT: Well, why don't we cease that name. I would like to get rid of that name --

MR. CHESLEY: As would we, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- as general principles in the bankruptcy

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

process. But you represent ABG?

MR. CHESLEY: Yes, Your Honor. We have --

THE COURT: And I gather that in any event, Mr. Roup will be providing consulting services to the new licensee?

MR. CHESLEY: Your Honor, there is a revision to Exhibit D that eliminates that reference. Mr. Roup will be resigning from the committee, will be becoming a member of the board, in that he may provide some assistance with respect to business con --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CHESLEY: -- business consulting from time to time, but there's no mention of it anymore with respect to Exhibit D to the sale order. So we have eliminated that as part of the negotiation, today, which we served again, in the intermediary role.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CHESLEY: The last thing I would mention, Your
Honor, is -- obviously we've been before the Court before -- we
were happy to participate in this process from the beginning.
It became clear to us, along with our partner, Leonard Green
Partners, that we were only interested in this transaction to
the extent we could serve as a conduit to a going-concern sale,
save these jobs and bring this company back to life.

We're pleased with all of the efforts, everybody's hard work, to do that; and we are graciously looking forward to

1	this process. It's cost us a little bit more money to make
2	sure that the debtors remained administratively insolvent
3	(sic), but we were willing to do so, Your Honor, to make sure
4	that this process got done, got done timely, and that the
5	workers would know when they went home for Christmas, that they
6	had jobs.
7	THE COURT: And you can endorse what the debtors' have
8	said from your perspective as counsel for the purchaser
9	proposed purchaser that there were no side deals that have
10	not been disclosed to the Court; that the parties have acted at
11	arm's length and in good faith throughout?
12	MR. CHESLEY: Absolutely, Your Honor. I can affirm
13	that as a representative of the court.
14	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
15	MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?
17	All right. Now, I think Mr. Thomas, you were going to
18	have one of your colleagues deal with some of the assumption
19	and assignment issues.
20	MR. THOMAS: Thank you.
21	MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. Peter Young,
22	Proskauer, for the debtors.
23	Your Honor, there were nine filed objections on
24	contract and assumption issues and one informal objection that

the debtors received. And I'd like to walk Your Honor through

each of them and let you know what our resolution has been;
eight of which, I believe, are fully resolved, and two of which
we think are resolved; there may be some commentary from the
counsel on telephone to the contrary. But I don't believe so.

Your Honor, Simon Property Group, at docket number 202, filed an objection on --

THE COURT: The filed a withdrawal of objection.

MR. YOUNG: They filed a withdrawal at docket number

THE COURT: All right.

264.

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, docket number 206, Madison and 54th Street Associates, filed an objection to the cure amount. That objection was resolved by the debtors' revised schedules 2.3 and 3.7 to the APA which were filed at docket number 239. That revised the cure amount so that Madison and 54th Street Associates no longer objects to the proposed cure amount by the debtors.

Your Honor, Iron Mountain Information Management filed an objection at docket number 209. The objection was to the adequate specificity of the contracts that were presume -- that were proposed to be rejected -- sorry, assumed. The debtors have taken those contracts off of the assumption list, and they're no longer to be assumed and assigned. That resolves the objection of Iron Mountain Information Management.

Your Honor, at docket number 210, Jonesheirs, Inc., a

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

licensor to the debtors, filed an objection that they said that they would withdraw in the event that there was a going-concern bid to ABG and the licensee W Diamond. They have withdrawn that objection at docket number 262.

Your Honor, docket number 213, Infor Global Solutions filed an objection on the grounds that these are licenses that could not be assumed and assigned without the licensor's consent. Ms. Guilfoyle is on the line. The debtors' response, Your Honor, is to take off the license agreements from the assumption list. This is done in conjunction with ABG and W Diamond, who will no longer, at this time, seek to assume and assign these agreements.

We're leaving open the possibility of an arrangement to be made between W Diamond as licensee, and Infor, at a later time, at which we would seek to assume and assign these contracts, if in fact, a deal is struck. If not, the debtors will seek to reject these three licenses.

THE COURT: Counsel, can you hear us?

MS. GUILFOYLE: Yes, I can, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. GUILFOYLE: Just for the record, I'm Tori
Guilfoyle on behalf of Infor Global Solutions Michigan. And
thank you, Your Honor, for letting me appear telephonically.

Although the debtors are not seeking to assume and assign the Infor agreements in connection with today's request

for approval of the sale, Infor does have a slight concern with 1 2 the proposed transaction. If in connection with the sale, the debtors will transfer the computer equipment that contains the 3 4 Infor software to the purchaser, which will then turn around 5 and license that computer equipment to the new operating 6 company. So as a result of that transaction, a nondebtor who 7 is not the licensee of the Infor software, will have physical possession of the computer equipment and therefore the Infor 8 9 software. 10 THE COURT: Well, I suggest you take up the issue with counsel separately. We don't need a whole courtroom of people 11 12 to deal with this. I assume if the --13 MS. GUILFOYLE: I assure Your Honor we actually 14 have --THE COURT: -- if the --15 MS. GUILFOYLE: -- taken this point up with debtors' 16

MS. GUILFOYLE: -- taken this point up with debtors' counsel. And we requested proposed language to be added to the sale order that would protect Infor's rights and interests in their software pending a possible later assumption and assignment of Infor's software agreements. We included the language in our sale objection. I also circulated slightly revised language this morning to debtors' counsel. And as far as I know the debtors have not agreed to include that language in the sale order.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I guess I'm requesting Your Honor to order the

1	debtors to include the protective language to ensure that the
2	nondebtor, nonlicensees do not use the Infor software absent an
3	Infor-purchaser or Infor-operating company agreement.
4	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, the debtors are investigating
5	now whether they're using the software in any event, which is
6	the reason for their potential rejection of these contracts.
7	But what Ms. Guilfoyle asked us to include in the sale order
8	imposed obligations on the debtors which we don't think the
9	Code imposes upon us.
10	We're removing the three license agreements from the
11	list of those that will be assumed and assigned at this time,
12	and we will abide by the terms the debtors will abide by the
13	terms of the license agreements. We will instruct the
14	purchaser, to the extent that those are not purchased assets,
15	that they're not used in connection with those purchased
16	assets.
17	THE COURT: I guess you can take some steps to
18	effectuate that instruction, can you not?
19	MR. YOUNG: Certainly. Certainly.
20	THE COURT: And you intend to do so?
21	MR. YOUNG: We will.
22	THE COURT: And if you do not, you're simply creating
23	additional possible and I stress the words possible claims
24	against the estate.

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

MR. YOUNG: That's correct, Your Honor. And one of

25

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

the reasons we're willing to take these licenses off of the assignment and assumption list and leave them for a later day with respect to either assumption and assignment or rejection, is in large part because they don't create administrative liabilities for the estate. There are no amounts payable under these license agreements.

So we will, in short order, make a determination as to whether the buyer will seek an assignment or we will seek to reject those licenses.

THE COURT: All right. I don't think anything is needed for the order. The debtors intend to abide by their contractual responsibilities, and I have no information to the contrary. All right, next --

MS. GUILFOYLE: Your Honor, I was wondering if maybe possibly the purchaser or the new operating company's representatives would state on the record that they will not use the Infor software pending this time period where the debtors may either reject or seek to assume and assign the Infor software. Because once again, the concern is they're going to be in physical control of the computer equipment so --

THE COURT: We don't -- we don't know -- we don't know when physical control is going to be turned over. We don't know the circumstances of obtaining the computer equipment.

And we do not know what will be done with the computer equipment.

You have put the parties on notice of their of your
concern and the fact that you apparently are intent on making
the transfer of any rights here so difficult and so onerous
that it may be that the purchasers will have no interest
whatsoever in dealing with your client. That's for another
day. They are not going to attempt to assume and assign the
contract.

And you may well, on behalf of your client, have a perfect pyrrhic victory, where there is no assumption and assignment, but no business whatsoever for your client. But that's for another day. The parties are on notice and are requested to pass on your concerns to their businesspeople, so care is taken not to create additional problems. And I don't think we have to spend any more time on this matter today.

Next?

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor --

MS. GUILFOYLE: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, with respect to docket numbers 223 and 229, in each case there were objections to proposed cures, proposed assumptions. They will no longer be on the assumption and assignment list.

THE COURT: All right. Another pyrrhic victory for the objector.

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, with respect to docket number 230, Destiny Holdings, which is one of the landlords of the

1	debtors, Mr. Newman is on the phone. I believe we've resolved
2	all issues subject to one caveat, that is, that Mr. Newman
3	wants to see revised cure amounts to which the debtors have
4	agreed with Mr. Newman's clients, as set forth on Exhibit B to
5	the APA, which will be the final place at which those cure
6	amounts are reflected.
7	THE COURT: All right. Do we know the numbers? Do
8	you have the numbers in front of you?
9	MR. YOUNG: I don't.
10	THE COURT: If you don't, then we'll go on. We won't
11	take the time.
12	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, I understand
13	MR. NEWMAN: Your Honor, this is
14	MR. YOUNG: oh. Mr. Newman, I understand, from the
15	debtors' side, the number is \$7,621.95 plus outstanding
16	attorneys' fees due to Mr. Newman and his firm.
17	MR. NEWMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Let's not spend any more time
19	and run that up double by keeping a lot of lawyers here today.
20	Next item?
21	MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, the last filed objection was
22	filed by Midland Loan Services, a special servicer, on the Des
23	Plaines mortgage. Your Honor may note that the Des Plaines
24	mortgage holder is a company called HMX Touhy LLC. It is a
25	nondebtor. Its equity interest at HMX Touhy LLC are owned by

HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.

HMX Des Plaines LLC, also a nondebtor. One hundred percent of the equity interest of HMX Des Plaines LLC is owned by debtor HMX Acquisition Corp.

Neither Touhy or Des Plaines were obligated on the senior debt and are not debtors. Nevertheless, the APA contemplates the transfer of the real estate owned by HMX Touhy LLC to ABG and to W Diamond, specifically in the purchase.

Our plan, Your Honor, is to effectuate that outside of court. We're going to amend the APA to reflect that the equity interests of HMX Touhy-Des Plaines are transferred to the purchaser, so as not to trigger ownership changes at the HMX Touhy level.

There was an objection filed that we were seeking to have Your Honor approve an assignment and assumption of that mortgage or of the deed or of the loan. We are not, Your Honor. They're included simply because we're trying to transfer the real estate.

There was an objection, Your Honor, by the special servicer to that transfer, because the special servicer has indicated that they believe the transfer will trigger a default under the mortgage. The way we're hoping to solve that, Your Honor, is to have Your Honor's order approve a sale of the assets to ABG and W Diamond. That equity interest will occur in connection with the sale. Ultimately, W Diamond as licensee will work directly with the special servicer to get the consent

of the lender ultimately to that transfer. And that transfer will become effective upon further notice to this Court.

W Diamond's counsel will file a notice saying the transfer was effected by virtue of the agreement between the lender and the essential -- the new owner. That will take place, Your Honor, probably after closing, but will be documented in a third amendment to the APA which will be attached to the order approving the sale.

THE COURT: And the counsel to the special servicer is on the line?

MR. YOUNG: He is here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He is here.

MR. LEVIN: I didn't feel I warranted a seat at the table, so I stayed at the back. But Your Honor, I was admitted pro hac vice in this matter by the Court on December 17th.

THE COURT: Well, it would be helpful if you gave us your name.

MR. LEVIN: I would -- Matthew Levin with Kilpatrick
Townsend & Stockton, representing Midland Loan Services, which
is, as Mr. Young indicated, the special servicer for the loan
in question.

I agree with counsel. I think we've resolved this.

The one other thing I wanted to state on the record is that

counsel did agree to insert into the order -- the sale order,

that is -- language to the effect that nothing in the order is

seeking to effectuate a sale of the real properties, because that's now changed, and that everybody's rights are preserved in terms of the loan documents, since these are all with respect to Midland and HMX Touhy, nondebtors in this case.

We didn't want there to be any ambiguity that the order in any way affected those rights. And I believe that was agreed to.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. LEVIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And we have the City of Des Plaines on the phone too? They want to be sure the taxes are paid. Is that right?

MR. DAMBACH: Well, we were primarily -- this is Alex Dambach from the City of Des Plaines. Our primary concern, of course, is that this sale goes through successfully. We're concerned for the jobs and the -- and of course, we do want to make sure that they do pay taxes when they come due.

THE COURT: Well, maybe you need to talk to the special servicer. But my experience is that that's not easy. But since there actually is a human being here in court, counsel for the special servicer, you actually have somebody to talk to. And that's a big step forward.

All right. I appreciate the fact that the parties have been able to work out the technical details. And I gather -- do I have a -- I don't remember seeing a clause in

	this	draft	of	the	sale	agreement.
ı		$\alpha_{\perp}\alpha_{\perp}c$	\sim \pm			CAT COMOTICE

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Levin is drafting for us, if he has not already, some language, Your Honor, that we've agreed to include.

THE COURT: All right. Now, let me just say that this is -- "this" being the sale order, is thirty-three pages. If you draft too lengthy a paragraph, you may well approach the all time record of sale orders in this court. And that would not be a good thing.

MR. YOUNG: No one wants that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I already intend to penalize counsel for every page over page 20 for sale orders.

MR. LEVIN: I'll make it a separate paragraph.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. We'll get to the form of the order in just a few minutes.

MR. YOUNG: I'm going to let Mr. Thomas come back, Your Honor, for that portion.

Your Honor, there was one informal objection that was also lodged by another landlord, Neapolitan Enterprises. And on December 13th, when the debtors filed revised schedules 2.7 -- sorry, 2.3 and 3.7 to the APA, we revised a cure amount in favor of Neapolitan Enterprises. They have a deadline to object to that proposed cure amount of December 24th and wanted to make sure that their rights were preserved.

I indicated that I would say on the record that, in

1	fact, their rights are preserved, and that remains the deadline
2	for objections.
3	THE COURT: All right. And that covers all of the
4	filed and informal objections in terms of assumption and
5	assignment and cure amount.
6	MR. YOUNG: Correct.
7	THE COURT: I think there were there several
8	licensors who claimed to have the right to prevent the sale of
9	certain instruments? And you've covered them all.
10	MR. YOUNG: We have, Your Honor. Jonesheirs consented
11	by filing their withdrawal. Argyle Culture, we've taken off
12	the list and will not seek to assume those licenses. And you
13	heard on the Infor issues, those licenses
14	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
15	MR. YOUNG: have been removed.
16	THE COURT: All right.
17	MR. YOUNG: Certainly, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Does anyone wish to be heard
19	on any of the issues that have been raised today?
20	MR. SPEARS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Spears
21	of Alston & Bird for Jonesheirs. I would simply note for the
22	record that Jonesheirs' consent is subject to appropriate
23	documentation. And until such documentation is executed,
24	Jonesheirs reserves all of its rights.
25	THE COURT: What documentation were you looking for?

1	MR. SPEARS: Documentation regarding the ultimate
2	assignment to W Diamond Group.
3	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else?
4	All right. Shall we proceed to the sale order?
5	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor. Mark Thomas on
6	behalf of the debtors.
7	We were able to tender to your clerk about fifteen
8	minutes before our scheduled 2:30 start, a black-line of the
9	proposed order against the version that was filed as an exhibit
10	to docket number 21. We did spend some time with all the
11	parties-in-interest, and we have made some additional changes.
12	So what I would propose, Your Honor, is that we go
13	through the order, I try to highlight the changes, and we will
14	go back, create a clean copy, upload all the exhibits, and file
15	it. I would note also that Exhibit D has changed a bit, based
16	on
17	THE COURT: All right.
18	MR. THOMAS: negotiations.
19	THE COURT: All right. Why don't you tell me all
20	material changes. If any party wishes every change to be
21	noted, they certainly may. But I assume that the principal
22	parties here, or anyone who wishes it, will get a copy of the
23	revised version a or a further black-line copy. And I'll
24	have some comments on the sale order as we go through.
25	I'm looking at the black-line version that you gave us

1 this afternoon.

MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. It has "Version 4" on the bottom on the first page.

THE COURT: Correct. All right, where do you --

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, I'm on page 17 looking for material changes. There's a lot of changes. I would say most of it is conforming changes, cleanup changes.

THE COURT: All right. We'll go through it as quickly as we can. Page 10, I've basically accepted a proffer of the good faith of the parties, including Mr. Williams, in negotiating the terms of the various agreements, that all agreements among the purchaser, the licensee, and the debtors and any related entities, have been disclosed. There are no undisclosed side deals. Parties have acted at arm's length and in good faith for the reasons stated on the record previously.

So I'll accept that as a proffer, unless anybody wishes any further examination or wishes to have the record further elaborated. All right.

On the top of page 11, you have throughout, where we speak of the purchased assets are sold free and clear. I'm comfortable stating free and clear of all liens, claims, encumbrances, and interests. When we add the words "leaseholds and possessory rights", I get into an area that I don't understand, and I'm not sure that the bankruptcy court can affect an easement on property. I don't think that's intended.

1	Section 363(f) uses the word "interest". So I would
2	strike, throughout, the term "leaseholds and possessory
3	rights". I don't think you're trying to divest anyone of any
4	leasehold interest or any easement or anything like that.
5	And
6	MR. THOMAS: I think it's appropriate, Your Honor,
7	especially since
8	THE COURT: we don't have the Seventh Circuit law
9	on the subject here, and I don't think we want it.
10	MR. THOMAS: I think it's appropriate to strike it.
11	And we don't even have any real estate being transferred, as
12	Mr. Young
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. THOMAS: explained.
15	THE COURT: All right. On page 12 and you're
16	welcome to object to or comment on any of my comments.
17	Paragraph T, line 2, I would strike the word "all" and insert
18	"one or more of the requirements of Section 363(f)". And two
19	lines down, I would just strike "including any interest arising
20	under 365(h) of the Bankruptcy Code", because I don't know that
21	that means.
22	Page 13. I don't think I can enjoin any party. I
23	have no problem in saying they're barred. But I think that on
24	the top of 13, the words "and in each case are enjoined" and to
25	the end of that paragraph, should be stricken. In paragraph X

we have, two lines from the bottom, another "leasehold and 1 2 possessory rights." I assume that with the revisions to the list of 3 assumed contracts, paragraph CC is correct. Paragraph 1, I'd 4 appreciate it if you'd strike the word in the second sentence 5 "in all respects". I don't know what that means. Paragraph 2, 6 7 page 16 first line, same words. Many of the lawyers in this 8 room have heard me --9 MR. THOMAS: I've heard you --10 THE COURT: -- do this before. MR. THOMAS: -- I've heard you. I should have 11 12 remembered. I'm sorry, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, it depends who drafted this. 13 14 Paragraph 5, same thing, last three words. Paragraph 15 6 has "leaseholds and possessory rights", as does paragraph 8. And I think I would strike, again, the words "including any 16 17 interests arising under 365(h)". 18 And now, you're on 17 for a change -- for a new -- or did I get that right? 19 20 MR. THOMAS: I did say that, Your Honor. And I'm 21 circling to find out what the -- I think there was -- I recall 22 in paragraph 7, there was an amendment to the asset purchase 23 agreement. The second amendment to the asset purchase

agreement picked up the transfer as a purchased asset of sort

of the right to payments under the Wool Trust Fund program and

24

25

1	the licenses thereunder.
2	THE COURT: That's already in paragraph 7.
3	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
4	THE COURT: In my version.
5	MR. THOMAS: Right. And it hadn't been initially,
6	because it in the original contract, it hadn't been a
7	purchased asset.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, on page 18, we inserted
10	paragraph 9. The U.S. Trustee requested that we make clear
11	that the purchaser would be bound and comply with the debtors'
12	proxy policies.
13	THE COURT: I thought I saw the U.S. Trustee's fine
14	hand in that paragraph. Yes.
15	MR. THOMAS: And we did it.
16	THE COURT: And just before that, we have another
17	reference to "leasehold and possessory rights". All right.
18	Page 19?
19	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, just clean-up on page 19.
20	THE COURT: Right. I have one clause. I think right
21	in the middle of that page it's the line starting with the
22	words "the closing date under the APA".
23	MR. THOMAS: I know there's an injunction
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MR. THOMAS: that. I assume we should remove

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	THE COURT: I would appreciate your striking just the
2	words "and permanently enjoined".
3	MR. THOMAS: Right.
4	THE COURT: I see how the sentence is supposed to
5	read. I think it might read more easily if you just strike
6	"under the APA" from the two lines up from there. But
7	because I think the closing date is defined. But I see now how
8	that's supposed to work.
9	Don't you need, in the sentence starting with "Similar
10	act" "including any claim for any tax arising under a bulk
11	sales or similar act, prior to the closing date"? Don't we
12	need that clause?
13	MR. THOMAS: Okay, yes.
14	THE COURT: Paragraph I'm on page 20.
15	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Paragraph 12 it's new number 12, line
17	4, I would just add the concept in there "after due demand".
18	And then I go to page 22. Do you have any
19	MR. THOMAS: Nothing material, Your Honor, prior
20	THE COURT: Second line after the word "closing", I
21	think it would read better, rather than to have a little (ii),
22	strike the (i) and the (ii) and then say, "whether or not
23	assessed prior to the date of closing". I think that's the
24	that's the idea.
25	I think paragraph 18 should be deleted. Paragraph 17,

I think is a repetition, but I'm not going to dwell on that, except the shorter we get it the smaller the penalty will be.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't -- I think that we can -- page 24, first line, we've got the word "enjoined", and I would strike in the second line, "and including any alleged obligation for environmental cleanup or similar liability". If it's a claim, it's a claim. And that, I think, is sufficient protection.

MR. THOMAS: And, Your Honor, we agreed with counsel for the licensee on some changes to the last sentence of that paragraph.

THE COURT: Well, I didn't understand the last sentence at all. So --

MR. THOMAS: The last sentence was supposed to be a sort of default rule that in the event that there were contracts that had neither been assumed nor rejected, just unidentified contracts out there, that they would be deemed to be assumed by the licensee. What we've determined is, in lieu of sort of the automatic assumption, we're going to revise that language to provide that, in effect, in the event the debtors become aware of or identify any contracts that have not been put on an assumed or reject list, that we would provide the licensee with notice -- written notice. The licensee would have a period of time, and then we would decide whether to assume or reject. And we would reserve rights in case there

1 had been accruals.

The concern was potentially unidentified contracts that were accruing administrative liabilities that we weren't aware of.

THE COURT: That makes complete sense. That's fine.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

THE COURT: You may want to -- and this is up to the parties; I'm not trying to dictate it at all -- give the licensee the right to -- with the consent of all interested parties -- designate additional contracts for assumption. I think that's probably assumed. If the licensee wants it. I know this has been done very quickly. It wouldn't seem to me that that could disadvantage the debtor, so long as the counterparty to the contract gets notice and opportunity to be heard on cure amounts or on adequate assurance or on any other issue.

Mr. Halperin?

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, I think that actually makes a lot of sense. Procedurally, it'll save some time rather than teeing up another motion to assume each time. So we'll work with debtors' counsel on the language.

THE COURT: Well, I do think -- I think eventually you'd need some motion before the Court, which you could have on short notice. It's really a question of giving notice to the creditors, giving notice to the counterparties.

1	MR. HALPERIN: Absolutely, but
2	THE COURT: And an opportunity to be heard.
3	MR. HALPERIN: But the procedure you just suggested
4	says that if everybody's on board, it's just designated; we
5	don't have to come back with more motion practice just to do
6	something on consent. I think it makes a lot of sense.
7	THE COURT: Well, you may need an order. I wasn't
8	suggesting we do away with any just that you would have the
9	right to move it and to move it quickly, on short notice.
10	MR. THOMAS: I think that's a good suggestion, given
11	the fact that the assumed and rejected contract list seems to
12	be sort of a moving target, because we have been moving so
13	quickly.
14	THE COURT: Anything else before page 26?
15	MR. THOMAS: No, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: All right, on page 26 paragraph 26, I
17	would strike the words in the very middle of that paragraph,
18	"or restrict use of the premises which are demised by an
19	assumed contract to a specific tenant". It seems to me, if you
20	have that right, you have it. But I can't give it to you if
21	you don't have it.
22	In the first line of page also on page 26 on the
23	last line, I would add after "notice", "any party that failed
24	to object to assumption and assignment after notice, is deemed
25	to have consented".

1	Now, we get to the payment of the purchase price. I
2	appreciate the testimony with regard to administrative
3	solvency. Did the notice of the transaction of the sale to the
4	purchaser give notice that the Salus claim would be paid out of
5	the proceeds?
6	MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: It did?
8	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
9	THE COURT: So that's noticed.
10	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
11	THE COURT: All right. But I don't think it gave
12	notice that William Blair would be paid out of the proceeds,
13	did it?
14	MR. THOMAS: I do not believe it did, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Well, then William Blair is just going to
16	have to wait. They put in their application like anyone else.
17	They can be heard I'll hear you. But there's no basis to
18	have William Blair get paid.
19	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, Mr. Richards, in court on
20	behalf of William Blair, our financial I mean, our
21	investment banker, explains and I don't know if I have it
22	with me that the Blair engagement letter and the retention
23	order and it was negotiated with the U.S. Trustee's
24	Office contemplated that there would be payments of the
25	Blair fees as and when they were earned under the engagement

1	letter, with the express right that all those payments would be
2	subject to final fee applications and disgorgement. And in
3	fact, in the next page
4	THE COURT: Well, if it says that, you'll have to show
5	it to me.
6	MR. THOMAS: Well, Your Honor, the next page we
7	specifically on page 29, five lines down, we provide that
8	any amounts payable
9	THE COURT: Oh, I see that. It's subject to
10	disgorgement. But I have to see some notice to parties that
11	we're going to pay them at the closing. Because that is not
12	usually the procedure. But if it's provided for in their
13	engagement letter, then I'll approve it. How much are they
14	getting?
15	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we have not finally
16	reconciled the final fee, but I believe it's going to be in the
17	two-million-dollar range.
18	THE COURT: So of the five million you're getting from
19	Salus, they get almost half of that?
20	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, there's actually going to be
21	8.1 million dollars
22	THE COURT: Yes.
23	MR. THOMAS: coming to the estate. But yes, that
24	is the one of the major fees.
25	THE COURT: All right. But that's subject to

disgorgement if we have an administratively insolvent estate. 1 2 I want that very clear. MR. THOMAS: It's actually -- Your Honor, in the order 3 4 it provides it's subject to disgorgement, "based upon any court ruling on such fee application." 5 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll be happy to look at 6 7 their engagement letter to verify that it gives them the right to be paid out of the proceeds. 8 9 MR. THOMAS: Okay, Your --10 THE COURT: Because that is not the usual procedure. You wish to be heard? 11 MR. RICHARDS: Your Honor, I simply wanted to confirm 12 13 your statement, and the order reflects it of course. And it's 14 confirmed with the U.S. Trustee that we would, of course, be 15 filing a final fee application. Again, Geoffrey Richards, for the record. We would be, of course, be filing a final fee 16 17 application, and that our fees are subject to the Court's ultimate final approval of our fees with respect to that; and 18 19 that of course, any payment that is made is subject to, as the 20 order reflects, subsequent disgorgement or potential 21 disallowance in that regard, Your Honor. 22 And we had conferred specifically with the U.S. Trustee to assure the Court and the Office of the U.S. Trustee 23 24 that those provisions were clear in the order as they are.

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

MR. THOMAS: Yes, so, Your Honor, the order does

25

1	provide, "This order does not constitute final approval of
2	William Blair's fees and expenses. William Blair shall be
3	required to file a final fee application pursuant to the Blair
4	order, and any fees paid at closing shall be subject to
5	disgorgement based upon any court ruling on such fee
6	application."
7	THE COURT: And what if the Salus claim is challenged
8	by the committee? When does the committee's challenge period
9	end?
10	MR. KUGLER: I don't have the specific date, Your
11	Honor. I believe another forty-five days or so.
12	THE COURT: Or the
13	MR. THOMAS: I think it would be on or about January
14	21. But I think it was sixty days from entry of the final DIP
15	order.
16	THE COURT: And is that the committee's right, or is
17	that the right of any creditor? I don't recall.
18	MR. THOMAS: The committee is expressly granted
19	standing to assert any challenges against any of the Salus
20	claim, the releases, validity, priority, extent, avoidance
21	actions.
22	THE COURT: Then Salus has to disgorge?
23	MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, Your Honor. We understand the
24	rules of the game, and we would be prepared to do that if
25	there's a challenge.

1	THE COURT: All right. A successful challenge?
2	MR. ROSENTHAL: A successful challenge. Thank you,
3	Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Now, we're paying 150,000 dollars to
5	Salus?
6	MR. THOMAS: Yes. Your Honor, under the Salus credit
7	agreement, the lender is entitled to take reserves. And they
8	are taking a reserve in the event of a challenge. So the
9	concept here is that they will, in effect, hold 150,000
10	dollars, which will be added to their payoff. So they'll be
11	paid off. They will then hold 150,000 as a litigation reserve.
12	And the order provides that in the event that the challenge
13	period termination date occurs which is a defined term in
14	the DIP order the litigation reserve will be returned to the
15	purchaser to ABG, net of whatever actual fees and expenses
16	were incurred. Because ABG, in effect, is paying off a higher
17	purchase price by paying off an increased Salus claim.
18	THE COURT: And if I understand paragraph 34
19	correctly, the purchaser is paying 500,000 dollars, which is
20	deemed part of the Salus payoff, that Salus will pay over to
21	the debtors on account of the professional carve-out fee
22	reserve?
23	MR. THOMAS: That's correct, Your Honor. And we did
24	make some handwritten changes that are not in front of you that

counsel for Salus and counsel for ABG agreed upon to make this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a little bit more -- a little clearer, so that the cash purchase price that will be paid to the estate, will be the total amount of the Salus pre-petition plus post-petition claim plus 5.1 million dollars plus this 150,000 dollars plus the 500,000. So that's the total purchase price.

There is the Salus claim discount of three million dollars which is embodied in the second amendment to the asset purchase agreement. So, for example, if Salus' total prepetition and post-petition claim is sixty-five million dollars as of closing, the purchaser will pay sixty-five million dollars to the estate, and Salus only gets sixty-two million in full and final satisfaction. And that's how the estate will hold 8.1 plus the 500- referenced in paragraph 34. Salus will hold the 150- referenced in paragraph 33, subject to paying it back to the purchaser upon the expiration of the challenge period.

THE COURT: That goes back to the purchaser?

MR. THOMAS: To the purchaser, who is paying an increased purchase price, due to that reserve.

THE COURT: All right. Paragraph -- how does paragraph 35 work? And what are the numbers?

MR. THOMAS: Paragraph 35 is the -- Your Honor will recall, we had a motion where the debtors owned certain intellectual property that was used by its nondebtor Canadian affiliate called Coppley. We sold that intellectual property

as part of an intertwined sale. Coppley was in its own receivership. So there was a going-concern sale through a receivership. The receiver distributed, on an interim basis, 2.4 million dollars to Salus to pay down Coppley's direct obligation.

THE COURT: And how much was that?

MR. THOMAS: The direct obligation was approximately 3.4 million dollars. However, Salus also has a secured claim against Coppley as a guarantor of the debtors' obligation. But there's about an extra million dollars or so remaining in the Canadian receivership. And all of Salus' right, title, and interest, as a secured creditor in that receivership proceeding, will be transferred to the purchaser as part of the payoff of the Salus debt.

we've all been trying as hard as possible to get the money out of the Canadian receivership prior to closing, and it just doesn't appear like it's going to happen. Everyone had projected that that money would have come in and paid down the Salus claim. It didn't happen. Therefore the purchaser is paying more. And it is buying the right to proceed in the Canadian receivership action and collect everything that was owed to Salus.

THE COURT: All right. Any other changes that you have up to page 30?

MR. THOMAS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Paragraph 36: why are we providing for releases? We have a release of Salus. I don't know if it's a release in the DIP order, but it is certainly a representation. And except for the reservation of rights that appears in there, I usually take out the word "release". But why are other parties getting releases in this particular order?

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, this -- there are no releases in paragraph 36 to anyone other than Salus. What -- Salus received a release in the final DIP order, and what they're doing in paragraph A, they received a release from the debtors. They are --

THE COURT: No. I ordinarily in DIP orders, take out the word "release". They get a stipulation as to the nonavoidability, validity, enforceability of their debt. But I ordinarily -- we can take a look at it -- take out the word "release", because I don't know what that means when the debtor has, through the committee, a challenge period.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, in this DIP order -- and I have it in these papers; I'll try to find it -- there actually is, in the final DIP order, the debtors granting Salus a complete release of all claims and causes of action subject to the committee's challenge period.

THE COURT: Well, I cert -- I wasn't careful enough.

1	It's as simple as that.								
2	MR. THOMAS: It's in there. I								
3	THE COURT: Well, let's look.								
4	MR. THOMAS: Okay.								
5	THE COURT: You can look and you can show me.								
6	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, if I may approach?								
7	THE COURT: Yes.								
8	MR. THOMAS: Docket number 168 is the, in effect final								
9	DIP financing order that was entered by the Court on November								
10	21. Paragraph 20 is the release we're talking about. And to								
11	tie it into this sale order, what Salus is seeking is that in								
12	addition to the debtors providing this release, subject to the								
13	committee's challenge, that William Blair, the committee, and								
14	the purchaser also release Salus from any claims that they								
15	might have against Salus.								
16	THE COURT: The committee can't do that. The								
17	committee still has the challenge period, doesn't it?								
18	MR. THOMAS: Yes. But it does say that release is								
19	subject to the challenge period in (b) in paragraph 36.								
20	THE COURT: But I don't understand why we don't stay								
21	with what we have in the DIP order. It is what it is.								
22	MR. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, Jeffrey Rosenthal on								
23	behalf of Salus Capital. We are releasing our liens and								
24	releasing our								
25	THE COURT: Of course you are. You have to. You have								

1	no choice.
2	MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, I have a choice, that you know,
3	I'm accepting money in return for the release of my liens. And
4	I will I had indemnification provisions
5	THE COURT: And your indemnification clause
6	undoubtedly says whether or not you're paid off in full, the
7	indemnification rights continue.
8	MR. ROSENTHAL: They do, Your Honor. But I have a
9	lien to secure those indemnification rights that I'm giving up.
10	THE COURT: And you routinely give it up when you get
11	paid off. Otherwise the title company won't transfer title,
12	and there's a standoff.
13	MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, there's no title company
14	involved here, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: I know there isn't.
16	MR. ROSENTHAL: It's a bill of sale. But
17	THE COURT: There's a bill of sale.
18	MR. ROSENTHAL: in this case, we are releasing all
19	of our liens
20	THE COURT: Of course you are.
21	MR. ROSENTHAL: and in return and giving up our
22	secured indemnification. So in return, we would expect that
23	people would release us
24	THE COURT: Who is "people"?
25	MR. ROSENTHAL: in order for them to have the

1	procee in order to have the proceeds. Those people are							
2	getting paid							
3	THE COURT: Well, the purchaser the purchaser can							
4	do what it wants. William Blair can do what it wants. If they							
5	want to release you, they can release you. The committee, I							
6	don't think the committee has any other any other claims.							
7	The debtors may. But if the let me see the language in the							
8	DIP order.							
9	Well, this one got past me. All right. There won't							
10	be another one.							
11	MR. ROSENTHAL: Noted.							
12	THE COURT: Okay.							
13	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the committee, though, still							
14	reserves its rights. I mean, the challenge period is there.							
15	So the release doesn't vitiate the committee's right to							
16	investigate and challenge.							
17	THE COURT: All right. Paragraph 37 is repetitious, I							
18	think. But I'll leave that to you to look at. Paragraph 39 is							
19	much too broad in terms of giving the parties the right to							
20	amend. You can easily restrict this and also provide that any							
21	amendments should be filed on the docket.							
22	Paragraph 40, you want me to approve these terms?							
23	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we are seeking the approval.							
24	It was the and we acknowledge, however, that certain of							

these terms would only be implemented pursuant to a plan, which

means	they're	only	 they're	${\tt approved}$	subject	to	being
impler	mented.						

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Right. Can we add those words?

MR. THOMAS: Certainly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Subject to a plan or other appropriate formalities -- or I think you can find a better word than "formalities".

MR. THOMAS: We can do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And you had some changes to Exhibit D.

MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. May I approach? I think --

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. As long as all parties have had a chance to see them. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the Exhibit D, the principal issue in paragraph B is to make it clear that the seat that's held for the benefit of the creditors is subject to and expires upon, in effect, the payment in full of the claims of the constituency that is entitled to that seat. So when the -- if and when the committee or its successor is paid in full, it no longer will have the right to a seat.

There's some agreed-upon limitations as to who may subsequently hold the committee's seats. There is the agreement by the committees that they will support certain releases in a plan, which will be subject to voting and court

approval. And there's, in effect, the concept that the holders of allowed claims do not have distribution rights in perpetuity. They obtain the rights to distribution of profits up and to the allowed amount of their claims.

And Mr. Kennedy -- that does not apply -- Your Honor, we spoke of the ten percent profit participation units that would be available to all the workers, the rank and file, including the union members. That is -- that doesn't expire. There is not a cap on that, as it were.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. HALPERIN: Neither that nor to -- there are three buckets: management, workers and the unsecured creditors. The management and the workers was something that Mr. Williams had contemplated originally, and that's going to go on. It's only with respect to creditors, and that's capped to the amount of the debt.

THE COURT: All right. And I see you changed the present release by the committee and union of Mr. Williams to they'll support a release in a plan.

MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, the contemplation is that the release will all be --

THE COURT: And you say "until such time the committee and its members agree that they will neither investigate, seek to investigate or pursue any claims against them, to the extent such claims exist." That's a little ambiguous.

1	Wouldn't it be better to say "until such time the
2	committee and its members represent that they do not believe
3	that any such claims exist"?
4	MR. KUGLER: Your Honor, that would be acceptable to
5	the committee.
6	THE COURT: Mr. Halperin?
7	MR. HALPERIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: All right. Well, that certainly clears
9	the record.
10	MR. THOMAS: We would make that change, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Well, I
12	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, I one other point. The
13	parties there in the second amendment to the asset purchase
14	agreement, the concept of a transition services agreement and
15	the parties reaching an agreement on a transition services
16	agreement was agreed upon. That document is not finalized.
17	And so if and when the transition services agreement is
18	finalized and executed, we will be filing it with the Court.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	MR. THOMAS: People are willing to go forward and get
21	the sale order approved, move to closing without that being
22	finalized right now.
23	THE COURT: When do you expect to close?
24	MR. THOMAS: The closing is expected to occur on
25	Friday, December 21st. We are eager everyone's eager.

1	Everyone's working hard to do closing as soon as possible.
2	It's prior to Christmas. It'll be a good Christmas present.
3	And it's also really critical that these assets move into a
4	well capitalized, appropriate steward that can infuse some much
5	needed money into the system so that the factories can start
6	getting stocked with materials, as Mr. Kennedy mentioned
7	earlier. It's critical that a closing occur as soon as
8	possible.
9	THE COURT: All right.
10	MR. THOMAS: So, Your Honor, I would just because
11	this has been a process and the order continually changes, I
12	would request that counsel for the committee confirm that the
13	sale order, as we've discussed and as the changes have been
14	reviewed, is acceptable to the committee?
15	MR. KUGLER: That's true and accurate, Your Honor.
16	There's some changes we discussed before that we didn't cover
17	right now, but that as long as those discussions are
18	incorporated into it, that's absolutely accurate.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	MR. THOMAS: And, Your Honor, I would request that
21	counsel for Salus confirm that the sale order is acceptable?
22	MR. ROSENTHAL: Confirmed, Your Honor.
23	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, likewise counsel for the
24	licensee?
25	MR. HALPERIN: We'd like to take a final look at the

1	final version, but yes, I believe it's acceptable. Everything
2	we've heard is acceptable.
3	MR. THOMAS: And counsel for ABG, the buyer
4	THE COURT: We can call you the purchaser now, and
5	we'll leave
6	MR. CHESLEY: To the purchaser, it is acceptable, Your
7	Honor.
8	THE COURT: off the stalking-horse term.
9	MR. CHESLEY: And we appreciate all of your courtesy
10	and time.
11	THE COURT: No, you don't have to do that. But all
12	right, then, I'll approve the sale of substantially all the
13	assets of the estate, under the circumstances find that the
14	debtor has a sound business reason for entering into the sale,
15	and thank all of the lawyers and other professionals who have
16	obviously worked extremely hard to try to get this company
17	fixed and off to a good start under very difficult
18	circumstances in terms of the timing involved.
19	So I thank you all for your very obvious
20	professionalism in the representation of your respective
21	clients.
22	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right, you'll
24	MR. THOMAS: We have two I think we have two
25	THE COURT: e-mail me then tomorrow a revised

	HMX ACQUISITION CORP., ET AL.
1	copy
2	MR. THOMAS: We will
3	THE COURT: of the order.
4	MR. THOMAS: with all the exhibits. Your Honor, we
5	have two other matters on the agenda.
6	MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. Agenda item number
7	32 is a motion for a general bar date to be set in these cases.
8	THE COURT: You don't you don't need a motion for
9	that. As long as the committee's seen it, and has signed off
10	on it, all you need to do is hand it up and I'll compare it
11	against our form. And if you slavishly
12	MR. YOUNG: We used your form.
13	THE COURT: follow our form, you won't get into any
14	trouble at all.
15	MR. YOUNG: We used your form and followed General
16	Order M-386, Your Honor. So we will submit that to Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: The purpose of that form is to save people
18	time and effort.
19	MR. YOUNG: It did.
20	THE COURT: It also saves the Court the need to read
21	them. No, we read them.
22	MR. YOUNG: Sure, Your Honor. Epiq will be receiving

MR. YOUNG: Sure, Your Honor. Epiq will be receiving claims, so as to take that burden off the Court as well, and off the clerk's office.

23

24

25

Your Honor, the only other item up is item number 33.

1	It's a motion for rejection of certain employment agreements.
2	Your Honor, these rejections are so as to ensure that the
3	estate doesn't incur any administrative expense claims on
4	account of employment contracts. If we could, Your Honor,
5	we'll submit to you electronically, a version of this order
6	which will attach a schedule of those contracts we're seeking
7	to reject. We're going to remove a couple from that schedule
8	that will be assumed by the purchaser.
9	THE COURT: And the
10	MR. YOUNG: That was served on all the counterparties.
11	THE COURT: the employees have received notice?
12	MR. YOUNG: They have, Your Honor. It went out by
13	overnight mail on December 4th.
14	THE COURT: And does anyone wish to be heard on this
15	particular motion?
16	All right, then I'll grant your motion.
17	MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Thank you again.
19	MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Good night.
21	IN UNISON: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 5:04 PM)
23	
24	
25	

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

CERTIFICATION I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. Penina waish. PENINA WOLICKI AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-569 eScribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040 Date: February 25, 2013

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net